



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/996,211	11/28/2001	Rene Lazecki	P/1336-156	1227
2352	7590	03/21/2005	EXAMINER	
OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN 1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NY 100368403			SAADAT, CAMERON	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3713	
DATE MAILED: 03/21/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SM

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/996,211	LAZECKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cameron Saadat	3713	

All Participants:

Status of Application: RCE

(1) Cameron Saadat.

(3) Joel Felber.

(2) Robert Faber.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 11 March 2005

Time: 4:00 pm

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:
 1, 3, and 20

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner initiated an interview to discuss claims 1, 3, and 20 for clarification of the claim language. Applicant proposed amended claim language to clarify the invention and to overcome the cited prior art. However, in view of the newly discovered reference to Sampson et al. the examiner indicated that a non-final office action would be mailed..